

REMARKS

In the Non-Final Office Action dated October 17, 2005, claims 1-31 and 36-43 are pending, claims 1-3, 5, 7, 14-24, 26-31, and 36-42 stand rejected, and claims 4, 6, 8-13, 25, and 43 are objected to. In particular, claims 15-17 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. 6,715,071 to Ono et al. ("*Ono*"), and claims 1-3, 5, 7, 14, 18-24, 26, 30-31, 36-40, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. 6,532,220 to Carneal et al. ("*Carneal*") in view of Ono.

With respect to the §112 rejections, the Office Action states that claims 15-17 and 27-29 are rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Action states that the terms "original form," "a reverse order form," "configured to differentiate the multiple forms of the data," and "configured to combine the multiple forms of the data" were not sufficiently described in the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Lines 10-16 on page 14 of the application as filed recites:

"The use of more than one stream for the same snippet allows a snippet to be sent in more than one form. For example, the LLT 440 may send a snippet in its actual form through one stream and in a form with bytes complemented and in reverse order through the other stream."

This passage describes and provides adequate support for the terms "original form" and "a reverse order form" as recited in the claims in question. This section further states that "the receiver always knows which form of the snippet was transmitted based on its stream number," which provides support for the recitation of "configured to differentiate the multiple forms of the data" in the claims in question. Furthermore, this section states that "the alternating use of different transformations... facilitates the reconstruction of a snippet from multiple corrupted received versions." This provides support for the recitation "configured to combine the multiple forms of the data" in the claims in question. Thus, the specification provides adequate support to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112 rejections of these claims.

With respect to the cited references for the §102 and §103 rejections, Applicant submits the enclosed Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 stating that the Applicant conceived of and reduced to practice the subject matter of the pending claims in the United States at least before June 25, 1999, the earliest priority date to which Ono claims the benefit. Applicant also encloses technical documents as Exhibits A and Exhibit B illustrating the conception of at least the subject matter of the pending independent claims 1, 20, 21, 36, 37, 38, 40, and 41. Applicant additionally encloses source code as Exhibit C illustrating the reduction to practice of these pending independent claims. The source code and technical documents were generated at least before June 25, 1999. Thus, Ono is not available as a prior art reference under §102(e) or §103 against the pending claims. As all of the §102 and §103 references rely at least in part on Ono, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 and §103 rejections of the pending claims.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response other than as reflected on the enclosed Fee Transmittal. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. BBNT-P01-320 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edward A. Gordon

Registration No.: 54,130

ROPES & GRAY LLP

One International Place

Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624

(617) 951-7000

(617) 951-7050 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant